

Start of new case

Q1 Does the draft guidance cover the relevant issues about the right of access?

☐ Yes

☒ No

☐ Unsure / don't know

If no or unsure/don't know, what other issues would you like to be covered in it?

There are grey areas in relation to what may constitute personal data - e.g. an email exchange at work where someone provides a view on an individual, without clearly naming them. E.g. "Employee X is a good worker" - would that be classed as personal information and covered by the DSAR process? We are often asked to search emails across multiple people's email accounts and multiple years - it takes a long time to manually review and determine what is or isn't PII - guidance would be very useful

Q2 Does the draft guidance contain the right level of detail?

☒ Yes

☐ No

☐ Unsure / don't know

If no or unsure/don't know, in what areas should there be more detail within the draft guidance?

Q3 Does the draft guidance contain enough examples?

☐ Yes

☒ No

☐ Unsure / don't know

If no or unsure/don't know, please provide any examples that think should be included in the draft guidance.

See comment in Q1

- Q4 We have found that data protection professionals often struggle with applying and defining 'manifestly unfounded or excessive' subject access requests. We would like to include a wide range of examples from a variety of sectors to help you. Please provide some examples of manifestly unfounded and excessive requests below (if applicable).
- None evidenced yet - we've not classed any under this category

- Q5 On a scale of 1-5 how useful is the draft guidance?

1 - Not at all useful	2 - Slightly useful	3 - Moderately useful	4 - Very useful	5 - Extremely useful
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

- Q6 Why have you given this score?

Still doesn't address the definition of PII for inclusion in the return, nor does it recognise that the original intention for a DSAR (to enable a data subject to understand and correct information that may be inaccurate) is now being mis-used to try and look for material to claim against or to waste an organisation's time

- Q7 To what extent do you agree that the draft guidance is clear and easy to understand?

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q8 Please provide any further comments or suggestions you may have about the draft guidance.

- Q9 Are you answering as:
- ☐ An individual acting in a private capacity (eg someone providing their views as a member of the public)
 - ☐ An individual acting in a professional capacity
 - ☒ On behalf of an organisation
 - ☐ Other

Please specify the name of your organisation:

Nando's

- Q10 How did you find out about this survey?

- ☐ ICO Twitter account
- ☐ ICO Facebook account
- ☒ ICO LinkedIn account
- ☐ ICO website
- ☐ ICO newsletter
- ☐ ICO staff member
- ☐ Colleague
- ☐ Personal/work Twitter account
- ☐ Personal/work Facebook account
- ☐ Personal/work LinkedIn account
- ☐ Other

Thank you for taking the time to complete the survey